

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

This matter comes before the Court on Defendant's Motion for Review of Magistrate's Order of Detention (#28), filed on August 2, 2012. On June 26, 2012, Defendant's previous counsel filed a Motion to Reopen Detention (#18), arguing that the Defendant was never fully interviewed by Pretrial Services in Arizona or Nevada. The Court denied Defendant's motion on the basis that Defendant was interviewed by Pretrial Services in Arizona, and the Court received and reviewed the Arizona report prior to the original detention hearing. *See* Order (#19). Defendant's new counsel now brings this motion arguing that the Arizona Pretrial Services' report likely did not address the possibility of placement at the halfway house because the Arizona Pretrial Services office knew that Defendant was being transported to the District of Nevada.

Defendant has failed to show any good cause for reopening his detention hearing or requesting the Court review its previous detention order. The Arizona Pretrial Services report dated May 1, 2012 appears to be based on a complete interview of the Defendant as it contains information relating to Defendant's history, residence and family ties; his employment and financial resources; his physical and mental health and substance abuse; and his prior criminal record. The Court already made a detention determination as to Defendant, finding there were no
...

1 conditions or combination of conditions that would reasonably assure Defendant's presence at trial.

2 Accordingly,

3 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Defendant's Motion for Review of Magistrate's Order of
4 Detention (#28) is **denied**.

5 DATED this 8th day of August, 2012.

6
7 
8 GEORGE FOLEY, JR.
9 United States Magistrate Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28